

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-39 are pending in this application after this Amendment. Claims 1-39 stand rejected. Claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0029264), hereafter Ogino in view of Schweikard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,501,981), hereafter Schweikard. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth hereafter.

The system described in the Ogino reference reduces an imaging processing load and makes medical images subjected to image processing more easily available (abstract). As described in Ogino, an image processing server is separately provided from the imaging devices or systems (via a network) for processing medical images. Using this arrangement, and as recognized by the Office Action at pages 2 and 3, the processing load on the local imaging systems is thereby alleviated and the local imaging systems “are not required to perform any of the post-processing operations on their local processor.” Thus, the medical images are processed not by the medical imaging systems, but by a separate processing unit.

In contrast, the claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 24, 30, 33 and 34 variously recite wherein the medical image information is post-processed using the medical imaging system. Thus, unlike the system of Ogino wherein medical images are not processed on the medical imaging systems, the claimed invention provides remote access to the medical imaging system, which is used to process the medical image information.

Moreover, the Ogino reference teaches away from using the medical imaging system to perform the processing operations and as recognized by the Office Action (discussed in more detail above). The Ogino reference is specifically concerned with reducing image processing load and accomplishes this result by removing the post-processing of images from the imaging systems. To modify the system of Ogino to post-process the medical images on the local imaging devices would defeat the inventive purpose of the Ogino reference. Thus, Applicant


submits that independent claims 1, 24, 30, 33 and 34 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references.

Additionally, the Schweikard reference does not describe remote access of a medical imaging system to post-process medical images, but instead to controlling operations during acquisition of the medical images by remote access.

Applicant also submits that dependent claims 2-9, 11-23, 25-29, 31, 32 and 35-39 recite additional subject matter not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references. The Office Action also does not specifically address and provide support for each of the dependent claims, thereby not affording Applicant a fair and full opportunity to respond. Additionally, dependent claims 2-9, 11-23, 25-29, 31, 32 and 35-39 are allowable based at least on the dependency of these claims from the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention and the pending claims in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: November 26, 2008

Evan R. Sotiriou, Reg. No. 46,247
THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
225 S. Meramec, Suite 725
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 584-4082
(314) 584-4061 (Fax)